

THE DJILAS-DEDIJER AFFAIR

- I. One year after first blow-up, Milovan Djilas (ex-V.P., once one of "Big Four") stands accused of criminal action against Yugo, together with his supporter Vladimir Dedijer (Central Committee member, Tito's biographer).
 - A. Original affair began with articles by Djilas, (then propaganda boss) in late '53. He proposed greater "political democracy."
 - B. Proposal brought out basic ideological dispute:
 1. On one hand, Tito and party leaders know that giving up political control would mean Yugo repudiation Communism. Hence "democracy" possible only in economic matters for present.

~~SECRET~~

2. On other hand, Djilas held any "democracy" impossible while party kept political control. Claimed no danger, since Yugos already had accepted socialism.
3. Party leaders first missed Djilas' double-talk heresy, which seemed, like their own line, to plug more economic "democracy."
 - a. Woke up only with attack on snobbery of Party wives, sybaritic lives of party bureaucrats.
 - b. Then condemned all Djilas' views, took away party, government jobs.
4. Dedijer was only important party member to support Djilas. Dedijer continued as Central Committee member, although dropped from foreign policy post in Parliament.

C. For next few months, all quiet.

1. Djilas, as private citizen, lived on government pension, did translations.
2. Dedijser taught at Belgrade University, claimed he was out of political work.
3. However, Djilas' stand for more "political democracy" was known within Yugo, touted abroad in interviews.

II. Affair revived 27 Nov '54, when 109-man Central Committee met on eve Tito's India trip.

Deliberations secret but we believe
A. ~~Held Djilas still too prominent~~, decided Dedijser should be disciplined.

L Latter still subject to party discipline, since Central Committee member, whereas Djilas only a private citizen.

B. Party Control Commission met (17 Dec 54)

to see whether Dedijer still supported Djilas' views.

1. Dedijer challenged committee's authority, walked out.
2. Then told all to Western correspondents.
3. Djilas also gave hostile interview to Western press.

C. V-P. Kardelj then blasted both men (27 Dec '54).

1. 28 Dec '54 proposal to strip Dedijer of party posts followed by removal parliamentary immunity.
2. Trial now being prepared for both men--charges: propagandizing against state. Both still at liberty.

D. Tito may have planned original action

to come in his absence, both ~~to~~ emphasizing its "routine" nature and ~~to~~ dissociating self from move in event repercussions among younger party elements.

1. In this connection, Foreign Minister (travelling with Tito) told Indian press 3 Jan '55 that trial charges made without consultation with Tito.
2. This comment perhaps designed to show Indians that Tito does not dictate all decisions in Yugo, also that case unimportant.
3. Could also indicate that some leaders in Belgrade, more ruthless toward "heretics", took hard action in Tito's absence.
4. Whatever the reason, should not interpret affair as split in Tito

iii. Consequences of affair--

A. Party and regime stability--no threat.

1. Top Yugo leaders, including army, firmly loyal to Tito regime.
2. Pro-Djilas Party members are without power--mainly junior elements, students, writers, intellectuals.

B. Foreign Policy--no change.

1. Can discount Dedijer's emotional claim of connivance between USSR and Yugo party for purge of those behind '48 break.
2. Djilas himself discounts any such Soviet influence.
3. Soviet reaction limited to reporting without comment.

C. Ideology--continued dilemma.

1. Even if men silenced, ideological dispute will continue.
2. Djilas realizes party is wrong, for control of power means no "democ-

3. Party realizes Djilas is wrong, for
loss of power means end of Yugo
Communism.

IV. Prospects--regime may react to unexpected
publicity as follows:

- A. Hush up case, possibly dropping criminal charges.
- B. Cut back some civil liberties, reversing recent trend. However, will avoid more obnoxious police techniques.
- C. Mild, fairly small purge pro-Djilas lower-level party members.
- D. General tightening of party discipline, particularly in press, universities, etc.
- E. Regime will continue own brand "Yugo socialism."
 - 1. Kardelj's speech (27 Dec '54), which sharply condemned Djilas and Dedijer, nonetheless reaffirmed 'liberal' policies.
 - a. Party to persuade, not direct.

b. Collectives are out--were

wrong to begin with--

cooperatives of Western type

are eventual answer for

socializing agriculture.

2. Regime will continue attempt to
prove that "democracy" can come
first in economy, while party
retains political power.